

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 and 43-56 were presented for examination. The Examiner allowed claims 1-18 and 44-56; and rejected claim 43. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all claims remaining herein, claims 1-18 and 43-56 as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

In his fourth paragraph, the Examiner indicated that a complete set of black and white drawings is required. Applicants mailed a complete set of formal black and white drawings to the USPTO on March 24, 2005.

In his fourth (second occurrence) and fifth paragraphs, the Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as non-statutory, on grounds that the preamble to claim 43 does not recite a technological basis.

Applicants' claim 43 as amended recites in the preamble that Applicants' method is "computer-implemented".


There is thus a technological basis in the preamble of claim 43. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 43 and to allow this claim as amended.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims remaining herein, claims 1-18 and 43-56 as amended; and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that, for any other reason, direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance

the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

July 8, 2005

  
Edward J. Radlo  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 26,793

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P. O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(415) 882-2402

cc: A. Glodjo (via e-mail)  
IP/T docketing CH